

Schrödinger equation as the universal continuum limit of nonrelativistic coherent hopping on a cubic spatial lattice

Lutz Polley

Physics Department
Oldenburg University
D-26111 Oldenburg

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The Schrödinger equation with scalar and vector potentials is the continuum limit of any coherent hopping process (where position eigenstates superpose with neighbouring eigenstates after a time step) whose hopping amplitudes are homogeneous in quadratic order of the inverse lattice spacing, inhomogeneous in first order, and satisfying a summability condition with respect to higher-than-next neighbours.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Bz

Discretization of space and time in the manner of lattice gauge theory has greatly contributed to the intuitive understanding of fundamental processes [1]. For example, differential equations like the Maxwell or continuity equations appear as visualizable, geometric relations when they are written in terms of links, plaquettes, and (hyper)cubes. As I wish to show here, there is yet another fundamental differential law, the Schrödinger equation, which amounts to a rather intuitive statement in terms of discretized space and quantum-mechanical superposition. The approach is similar to that of quantum lattice-gas models [2] used for efficient (quantum)computer simulation of the Schrödinger equation. Those models operate with unitary evolutions over a finite time step. It is then found that local algorithms require $2d$ -component wave functions, where d is the dimension of the spatial lattice. For single-component wave functions this implies that infinitesimal time steps are the only option, if locality is to be maintained. In the present paper, therefore, time will be continuous as in Hamiltonian lattice gauge theory [3].

To illustrate the point, consider the Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2} \quad (1)$$

on a 1-dimensional lattice with spacing a . A simple discretization of the second derivative is

$$\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2} = \frac{\psi(x+a,t) + \psi(x-a,t) - 2\psi(x,t)}{a^2}$$

After an infinitesimal step of time,

$$\psi(x, t + dt) = \psi(x, t) + \frac{idt}{2ma^2} \{ \psi(x+a, t) + \psi(x-a, t) - 2\psi(x, t) \} \quad (2)$$

Thus a wavefunction initially located on a lattice site will spread out to next neighbours (quite in contrast to a continuum delta function which would spread out uniformly to all of space) after a time-step dt . This reflects the role of “neighbours” in the most basic concept of motion. Equation (2) would therefore seem no less natural as an axiom than equation (1). Moreover, it is easy to argue that a quantum particle *must* move by forming superpositions. This is because of the intriguingly simple axiom that an instantaneous particle position already determines the state vector. Hence, no information exists in a position state about the direction of hopping or motion.

The hopping amplitude $idt/2ma^2$ is certainly not an intuitive expression but can be taken, instead of the particle mass, as the *ab initio* parameter.

In the following, hopping amplitudes are not restricted to any finite number of neighbours, but are subjected to a summability condition, eq. (5). It is further assumed that the hopping amplitudes realise the full translational and cubical symmetries of the lattice in $\mathcal{O}(1/a^2)$ while any inhomogeneities in the hopping process are of $\mathcal{O}(1/a)$. At present I can only justify these assumptions by the fact that a renormalization scheme exists in this case for the continuum limit $a \rightarrow 0$. A further input is the conservation of probability. It will then be shown that any process of this kind results in the standard nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation in the continuum limit, with a vector potential (10) and a scalar potential (12).

Consider a simple cubic lattice where $\vec{x} = a\vec{n}$ is the position vector of a site, a is the lattice spacing, and $\vec{n}$ an integer vector. The most general equation for “coherent hopping”, cast in the form of a differential equation with respect to time, is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \psi(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_{\vec{n}} \kappa(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) \psi(\vec{x} + a\vec{n}, t) \quad (3)$$

The hopping parameters $\kappa(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ are complex numbers. They could be time-dependent without changing the argument. Conservation of probability requires

$$\kappa(\vec{x} - a\vec{n}, \vec{n}) = -\overline{\kappa(\vec{x}, -\vec{n})} \quad (4)$$

An important case of reference is that of a free particle, characterized by hopping parameters with the full symmetry of the lattice. Then $\kappa(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) = \kappa(\vec{n})$ because of translational invariance. Cubic symmetry implies

$$\kappa(\vec{n}) = \kappa(-\vec{n})$$

so that all $\kappa(\vec{n})$ are purely imaginary because of (4). Most importantly, the symmetry also implies $\sum_{\vec{n}} \kappa(\vec{n}) n_i n_j \propto \delta_{ij}$. A convenient parametrization, incorporating the assumption about the order of magnitude, is

$$\sum_{\vec{n}} \kappa(\vec{n}) n_i n_j = \frac{i}{ma^2} \delta_{ij} \quad (5)$$

The reduced parameter m will be identified as the particle mass later on; the sign of m is discussed in the Conclusions. In general, the sum in equation

(5) need not converge. Assuming convergence here is the basis for the non-relativistic physics as it emerges in the form of the Schrödinger equation in the continuum limit.

Deviations of the $\kappa(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ from the symmetry of the lattice can be expressed through a complex-valued field $Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ defined, in accordance with the $\mathcal{O}(1/a)$ assumption, by

$$\kappa(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) = \kappa(\vec{n}) e^{iaZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n})}$$

$Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ is more general than the $U(1)$ lattice gauge potential in two respects: it can have an imaginary part $\Im Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$, and it is also defined for higher than next neighbours. Nevertheless, standard procedures of lattice gauge theory suggest to consider a “lattice covariant derivative” acting on any function $f(\vec{x})$ as

$$D_{\vec{n}} f(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{a} \left(e^{iaZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n})} f(\vec{x} + a\vec{n}) - f(\vec{x}) \right) \quad (6)$$

For two covariant derivatives in succession one finds

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 D_{-\vec{n}} D_{\vec{n}} \psi(\vec{x}, t) &= -e^{iaZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n})} \psi(\vec{x} + a\vec{n}, t) - e^{iaZ(\vec{x}, -\vec{n})} \psi(\vec{x} - a\vec{n}, t) \\ &\quad + \left(1 + e^{iaZ(\vec{x}, -\vec{n})} e^{iaZ(\vec{x} - a\vec{n}, \vec{n})} \right) \psi(\vec{x}, t) \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms of this can be identified with hopping terms in (3), and the last two with potential energy terms. As a consequence of (4),

$$D_{-\vec{n}} = (D_{\vec{n}})^\dagger$$

Hence, equation (3) can be rewritten as

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \psi(\vec{x}, t) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{n}} ia^2 \kappa(\vec{n}) (D_{\vec{n}})^\dagger D_{\vec{n}} \psi(\vec{x}, t) + W(\vec{x}) \psi(\vec{x}, t) \quad (7)$$

where, using (4) again,

$$W(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{n}} i \kappa(\vec{n}) (1 + \exp(-2a \Im Z(\vec{x}, -\vec{n}))) \quad (8)$$

Now consider the continuum limit $a \rightarrow 0$. If the function f in equation (6) is twice differentiable, it can be Taylor-expanded as

$$f(\vec{x} + a\vec{n}) = f(\vec{x}) + a\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} f(\vec{x}) + \frac{a^2}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 n_i n_j \nabla_i \nabla_j f(\vec{x} + \vartheta a\vec{n})$$

where $0 < \vartheta(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) < 1$. Expanding $\exp(iaZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n}))$ also, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\vec{n}}f(\vec{x}) &= \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}f(\vec{x}) + iZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n})f(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{O}(a) \\ (D_{\vec{n}})^\dagger f(\vec{x}) &= -\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla}f(\vec{x}) + \overline{iZ(\vec{x}, \vec{n})}f(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{O}(a) \end{aligned}$$

The $\mathcal{O}(a)$ terms are omitted in the continuum limit, so that the spatial derivative term of (7) becomes

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{n}} ia^2 \kappa(\vec{n}) (D_{\vec{n}})^\dagger D_{\vec{n}} \psi(\vec{x}, t) = \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{n}} ia^2 \kappa(\vec{n}) \left((\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla})^2 + i\Re Z \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} + i\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Re Z - \vec{n} \cdot (\vec{\nabla} \Im Z) - |Z|^2 \right) \psi(\vec{x}, t)$$

As it turns out, real and imaginary parts of $Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ affect the kinetic energy very differently. The $\Re Z$ terms can be interpreted as vector potential terms, if one defines

$$\vec{A}(\vec{x}) = ima^2 \sum_{\vec{n}} \kappa(\vec{n}) \vec{n} \Re Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) \quad (10)$$

The $\Im Z$ terms only contribute to the scalar potential. Another contribution to the latter is produced by completing the square with respect to $\vec{A}(\vec{x})$. Thus, starting from (7) and using (9), (5), and (8), one arrives at the general, nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2m} \left(i\vec{\nabla} + \vec{A}(\vec{x}) \right)^2 \psi(\vec{x}, t) + U(\vec{x}) \psi(\vec{x}, t) \quad (11)$$

where

$$U(\vec{x}) = W(\vec{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{n}} ia^2 \kappa(\vec{n}) \left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Im Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n}) + |Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})|^2 \right) - \frac{\vec{A}(\vec{x})^2}{2m} \quad (12)$$

The scalar potential $U(\vec{x})$ can be given any value desired by adjusting $\kappa(\vec{n})$ and $Z(\vec{x}, \vec{n})$ with $\vec{n} = 0$. These on-site hopping parameters neither affect the mass in eq. (5) nor the vector potential in eq. (10). But they do contribute a divergent term to $W(\vec{x})$ in (8), appropriate for additive renormalization, and a further, non-leading term to $U(\vec{x})$ in (12).

In conclusion, one can derive the general form of the Schrödinger equation using: (i) the absence of motional information from a position eigenstate, (ii)

the superposition principle for undecided alternatives, (iii) the statistical interpretation of wave functions, (iv) an assumption about the summability of hopping amplitudes (nonrelativistic condition), and (v) an assumption about the dependency of the hopping parameters on the lattice spacing (renormalization scheme).

The sign of the parameter m in equation (5) was assumed to be positive. This is a matter of convention only. The general implication of “coherent hopping” is that the kinetic energy of a free particle is either always positive or always negative.

For the definition of the mass parameter in (5) it was essential that a free particle find identical hopping conditions on every site of the lattice. But this also characterizes the lattice as a cartesian coordinate system. A generalized hopping scenario may thus explain why cartesian coordinates play such a preferred role in a wide range of quantum systems [4].

A point worth emphasizing is that the link variables of U(1) lattice gauge theory can be extended from phase factors to arbitrary complex numbers without changing the form of the Schrödinger equation—the extensions only contribute to the potential energy. Preliminary studies of the quantized U(1) gauge field indicate [5] that analogous terms, referring to hopping in the U(1) configuration space, are responsible for the magnetic field energy.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank B. M. Boghosian, E. Mendel, M. Nest, and J. Pade for important suggestions.

References

- [1] K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 2445; M. Creutz, Quarks, gluons and lattices, Cambridge 1983.
- [2] B. Boghosian, W. Taylor, Phys. Rev. E 57 (1998) 54; Physica D 120 (1998) 30; Int. J. Mod. Phys. 8 (1997) 705.
- [3] J. Kogut, L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1975) 395.
- [4] N. H. Christ, T. D. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 939.
- [5] L. Polley, work in progress.